

New Upper Limits on the Tau Neutrino Mass from Primordial Helium Considerations

A.D. Dolgov ¹ and I.Z. Rothstein

The Randall Laboratory of Physics

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Abstract

In this paper we reconsider recently derived bounds on MeV tau neutrinos, taking into account previously unaccounted for effects. We find that, assuming that the neutrino life-time is longer than $O(100 \text{ sec})$, the constraint $N_{eff} < 3.6$ rules out ν_τ masses in the range $0.5 (MeV) < m_{\nu_\tau} < 35 (MeV)$ for Majorana neutrinos and $0.74 (MeV) < m_{\nu_\tau} < 35 (MeV)$ for Dirac neutrinos. Given that the present laboratory bound is 35 MeV, our results lower the present bound to 0.5 and 0.74 for Majorana and Dirac neutrinos respectively.

¹Permanent address: ITEP 113259, Moscow, Russia.

Despite a considerable experimental effort it is still unknown whether or not neutrinos have a nonzero mass. The following upper bounds are known [1]:

$$m_{\nu_e} < 10 \text{ eV} \tag{1a}$$

$$m_{\nu_\mu} < 270 \text{ KeV} \tag{1b}$$

$$m_{\nu_\tau} < 35 \text{ MeV} \tag{1c}$$

More stringent bounds can be determined from cosmological considerations. Assuming that there is no cosmological constant, the masses of light ($m_\nu < O(100 \text{ MeV})$) stable neutrinos are bounded by the Gerstein-Zeldovich limit [2] which can be written as

$$m_\nu < 380 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{10^{10}}{t_U(\text{yrs})} - h_{100} \right)^2, \tag{1}$$

where t_U is the Universe age and $h_{100} = H/100 \text{ km/sec/Mpc}$ is the dimensionless Hubble parameter. By most estimates $t_U > 12 \text{ Gyr}$ and $0.5 < h < 1$. Thus the cosmological upper bound the neutrino mass (all weakly interacting flavors) is 40 eV. If there is a non zero cosmological constant the bound is somewhat less restrictive, $m_\nu < 200 \text{ eV}$ [3]. These bounds are obtained by ensuring that the energy density of relic cosmic neutrinos be less than the closure density, and do not apply if neutrinos are unstable with life-times smaller than the the age of the universe. Recently, it has been pointed out [4] that nucleosynthesis considerations can further constrain the mass of an unstable τ neutrino.

Nucleosynthesis calculations along with data on light element abundances constrains the number of effective neutrino species contributing to the cosmic energy density N_ν , to be less than 3.6 [5] (Note that in ref. [4] a slightly stronger bound $N_\nu < 3.4$ was used). This bound is a consequence of the fact that the rate at which the universe cools depends on the total number of species contributing to the cosmological energy density which in turn determines the light element abundances. Previously, it was thought that the contribution from a heavy neutrino species with $m > O(\text{MeV})$ could be neglected since its energy density was assumed

to be Boltzmann suppressed. However, after a massive neutrino decouples and becomes non-relativistic its' energy density grows relative to that of a massless species. Therefore, if the number density of a massive species at freeze out is on the order of the number density of a massless species, then the heavy species may have a greater effect on the light element abundance than a massless species.

In this paper we reconsider the bounds derived in ref. [4] taking into account a few effects which were neglected in that paper. Our results for the number densities are in reasonable agreement with theirs for the case of massive Majorana neutrinos but differ in the case of massive Dirac neutrinos. There is a rather large difference between our respective results for the effective number of neutrinos species contributed by the heavy ν_τ . We find a more stringent bound which allows no window between the experimental bound and the bounds derived here.

In the standard calculations of the relic abundance of a particle species disappearing due to annihilation, the following two essential assumptions are made: The particles in question remain in kinetic equilibrium, and Boltzmann statistics are applicable. In this case the Boltzmann kinetic equation can be reduced to an ordinary differential equation. If the species considered is relativistic or non-relativistic at the time of decoupling, the equation can be greatly simplified and relatively accurate analytical solutions can be found. However, for a species which is semi-relativistic when it decouples, there is no known analytical approximation and one has to integrate the Boltzmann equation numerically. As such, we will present some of the details of the calculations.

If we are concerned with the abundance of species ψ then the Boltzmann equation is given by (we specialize to the case $\psi + 2 \rightarrow 3 + 4$)

$$\frac{dn_\psi}{dt} + 3Hn_\psi = \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3} \int C[f] \frac{d^3p_\psi}{E_\psi}. \quad (2)$$

where $H = \dot{R}/R$ is the Hubble parameter. In this notation

$$n_\psi = g \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} f_\psi(E, t), \quad (3)$$

$f_\psi(E, t)$ is the phase space density of species ψ , and g is the number of degrees of freedom for ψ . $C[f]$ is the collision term given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{g}{(2\pi)^3} \int C[f] \frac{d^3p_\psi}{E_\psi} = & -\delta^4(\sum p)(2\pi)^4 \int d\Pi_\psi d\Pi_2 d\Pi_3 d\Pi_4 \\ & [|M_{\psi+2 \rightarrow 3+4}|^2 (f_\psi f_2 (1 \pm f_3)(1 \pm f_4)) \\ & - |M_{3+4 \rightarrow \psi+2}|^2 (f_3 f_4 (1 \pm f_\psi) (1 \pm 2))], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and

$$d\Pi_i = \frac{d^3p_i}{(2\pi)^3 (2E_i)}. \quad (5)$$

The amplitude M is summed over initial and final spins. Assuming that the initial and final states are in kinetic equilibrium we may write $f_a = n_a \exp(-E/T)/n_a^{EQ}$. Eq.(4) may be written as

$$\frac{dn_\psi}{dt} + 3\frac{\dot{R}}{R}n_\psi = -g_\psi g_2 \int d\Pi_\psi d\Pi_2 \left[\sigma v_{Moller} \exp(-(E_\psi + E_2)/T) \frac{(n_\psi n_2 - n_\psi^{EQ} n_2^{EQ})}{n_\psi^{EQ} n_2^{EQ}} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Following the notation of ref [6] we have defined

$$v_{Moller} = \frac{F}{4E_\psi E_2} = [|\vec{v}_\psi - \vec{v}_2|^2 - |\vec{v}_\psi \times \vec{v}_2|^2]^{1/2}, \quad (7)$$

where F is the particle flux. In the non-relativistic limit the Moller velocity reduces to the relative velocity.

It is convenient to introduce the dimensionless variable $x = m/T$ and the relative number density $r = n/n_0$, where m is the mass of annihilating particles and n_0 is conserved in a comoving volume². In terms of these quantities the Boltzmann equation takes the form:

$$\frac{dr}{dx} = \frac{n_0}{x(\dot{T}/T)} \langle \sigma v_{Moller} \rangle (r^2 - r_{EQ}^2) \quad (8)$$

² Often the number density n is normalized to the entropy density s . This choice is convenient because s is usually conserved in the comoving volume. However, if a species is annihilating while it has considerable energy density, then when it drops out of equilibrium the entropy will *not* be conserved.

It can be shown that [6]

$$\langle \sigma v_{Moller} \rangle = \int_{4m^2}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma(s - 4m^2) \sqrt{s} K_1(\sqrt{s}/T)}{8m^4 T K_2^2(m/T)}. \quad (9)$$

In this equation K_1 and K_2 are the modified Bessel functions and $s = (p_\psi + p_2)^2$. The squared amplitude integrated over the final particle phase space, for the annihilation of two Majorana neutrinos with mass m_{ν_τ} into fermions with mass m_f is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{spins} \int d\Pi_3 d\Pi_4 |M|^2_M &= 8\pi G_F^2 \frac{w}{s} \left[(C_V^2 + C_A^2)(m_{\nu_\tau}^2(m_f^2 - s/2)) + (C_A^2 - C_V^2)m_f^2(3m_{\nu_\tau}^2 - s/2) \right] \\ &+ \frac{32}{12} \pi G_F^2 \frac{w}{s^2} (C_V^2 + C_A^2) \left[\frac{w^2}{2}(s/2 - m_{\nu_\tau}) + \frac{s^2}{4}(s + 2m_f^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The analogous expression for the case of annihilating Dirac neutrinos is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{spins} \int d\Pi_3 d\Pi_4 |M|^2_D &= 32\pi G_F^2 \frac{w}{48} \left[(C_V^2 + C_A^2)(s - m_f^2 - m_{\nu_\tau}^2 w^2/s^2) \right] \\ &+ 4\pi G_F^2 \frac{w m_f^2}{s} (C_V^2 - C_A^2) (s/2 - m_{\nu_\tau}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We have defined $w = (s^2 - 4sm_f)$, where m_f is the mass of the final state particle, which for our purposes is the electron, or the other neutrinos species which we will take to be massless. In the non-relativistic limit the cross section for the annihilation of Dirac neutrinos reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_D v_{rel} &= \frac{G_F^2}{2\pi} m_{\nu_\tau}^2 (1 - z)^{1/2} (C_V^2 + C_A^2) \left[1 + \frac{\beta^2}{6} (5 - 2z^2 + \frac{3}{1 - z^2}) \right] \\ &+ (C_V^2 - C_A^2) \left[\frac{z^2}{2} \left(1 + \beta^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(1 - z^2)} \right) \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $z = m_f/M$, m_f is the decay product mass and β is the velocity in the center of mass frame. $v_{rel} = 2\beta$ in the rest frame of the plasma. We include this expression because our result differs slightly from those stated previously in the literature [7] [8].

To perform the numerical integration it is necessary to specify the function $n_0(T)$ as well as the function $T(t)$. In the simplest case the energy density is dominated by relativistic

particles in thermal equilibrium $\dot{T} = -HT$ and $n_0 \propto T^3$. In what follows we take $n_0 = 0.181T^3$ which corresponds to the equilibrium number density of massless fermions with two helicity states. The Hubble parameter is given by the expression

$$H = \sqrt{8\pi\rho/3m_{Pl}^2} = 1.66\sqrt{g_*}T^2/M_{Pl} \quad (13)$$

In this simple case all the quantities are defined in terms of the plasma temperature T and the numerical integration is straightforward. When there is a mixture of relativistic and nonrelativistic (or semirelativistic) species with a conserved number of nonrelativistic particles, one must substitute for g_* the expression

$$g_* = g_*^{Rel}(1 + \rho^{NR}/\rho^{Rel}) \quad (14)$$

where ρ^{Rel} and ρ^{NR} are the energy densities of relativistic and nonrelativistic species respectively. If we neglect the energy exchange between the relativistic and nonrelativistic species the rate of the cooling would be the same, $\dot{T} = -HT$ and we have to solve kinetic equation (8) subject to (14). For the choice of normalization $n_0 = 0.181T^3$ eq.(14) takes the form:

$$g_* = g_*^{Rel} + 0.554\langle E \rangle r/T \quad (15)$$

with $\langle E \rangle$ being the average energy per particle for the massive fermions. The massive neutrinos will have a thermal distribution as long as they remain in kinetic equilibrium, which is true down to temperatures $T_0 \approx 2$ MeV. Below this temperature the distribution function in the phase space changes from $\exp(-\sqrt{(m^2 + p^2)}/T)$ to $\exp(-\sqrt{(m^2/T_0^2 + p^2/T^2)})$. This change in the distribution function will modify the Boltzmann equation. For large masses it is not expected that these changes will have any significant effect. We have calculated affect of such changes and found them to be less the two percent for masses above 1 MeV. For masses $m < 1$ MeV, the neutrinos decoupled while they were still relativistic, so their number density will not be suppressed relative to a massless species. Thus in the case of $m < 1$ MeV, $r = 1$, and the massive neutrinos distribution in phase space is given by $\exp(-p/T)$. Given

this distribution function the average energy is $\langle E \rangle \approx (m^2 + 0.414mT + 3.151T^2)^{1/2}$. This approximate expression is accurate up to 0.5% and was used in our numerical work for the case of light neutrinos. We should also point out that for smaller masses, $m = 1 - 5$ MeV the Boltzmann approximation is not accurate and the helium abundance will decrease by 5-10% [11]. However, as we shall see, this will not affect our bounds.

Exchange of energy between massless and massive particles gives rise to a faster cooling. Covariant energy conservation demands that

$$\frac{\dot{T}}{T} \approx -H \left(1 + \frac{0.2r}{g_*^{rel} + 0.42r\frac{m}{T}} \right) - \frac{0.14\dot{r}(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{m}{T})}{g_*^{rel} + 0.42r\frac{m}{T}}. \quad (16)$$

This is valid if $\rho^{NR} < \rho^{ReL}$ and the massive and massless particles are in thermal contact. If this inequality did not hold the cooling rate would be different, and eq.(8) would not be valid since it was based on the assumption that the massive particles were in kinetic equilibrium.

We have numerically solved kinetic eq.(8) for $g_*^{rel} = 9$ and g_*^{nr} given by eq. (15). This corresponds to the case of two light neutrinos and one heavy. Note that g_*^{nr} depends on the unknown function $r(T)$ which is determined from the solution of the kinetic equation. Our results for the freeze out number density of the massive Majorana and Dirac tau-neutrinos are presented in fig. 1. We then calculated the n/p ratio taking into account that r is not a constant but decreases due annihilation of the heavy neutrinos. Furthermore, we used the exact expression for the average energy density of the heavy neutrinos by integrating the distribution function.

Bounds on the neutrino mass are derived by computing the net increase in helium production due to the presence of the heavy neutrino species. In accordance with the standard nucleosynthesis calculations almost all neutrons which survived down to the temperature $T_\gamma = 0.065$ MeV turn into He^4 . Thus, by comparing the neutron to proton ratio calculated for two massless neutrinos and one neutrino with mass m_{ν_τ} , to the ratio calculated for a variable number of massless neutrino species we may bound the neutrino mass. If the n/p ratio yield for a given mass m_{ν_τ} exceeds the ratio calculated for 3.6 massless species, then

that mass is ruled out. For the case of Dirac neutrinos we assume that the right handed species will be populated if $m_D < 0.74 \text{ MeV}$ [12]. From these considerations we find that, assuming the neutrino lifetime is longer than $O(100) \text{ sec}$, the following limits apply

$$0.5 < m_M < 35 \text{ (MeV)}, \quad (17)$$

$$0.74 < m_D < 35 \text{ (MeV)}. \quad (18)$$

Tau neutrinos with their mass in the region considered must be unstable in accordance with the Gerstein-Zeldovich limit. For our bounds to be valid the neutrino must not decay prior to primordial nucleosynthesis. Since the characteristic temperature scale is near 0.1 MeV the life-time should be larger than or of the order of 100 sec. For life-times shorter than 1 sec^3 , there will be no bound for Majorana neutrinos, but for Dirac neutrinos there will be small region of excluded masses near 1 MeV.

One could deduce bounds on both m_{ν_τ} and on τ_{ν_τ} accounting for the decay of ν_τ in the kinetic equation governing both the number density of ν_τ and the n/p -ratio. The final n/p -ratio depends not only the life-time of ν_τ but also on the type of particles in the final state. A considerable effect associated with the decay might emerge from the distortion of the electron neutrino spectrum if there is a decay into ν_e . This is analogous to the distortion of the spectrum of the electron neutrinos due to electron-positron annihilation in the standard scenario at the level about 1% found recently [9],[10]. The size of the effect in the case of massive ν_τ annihilation or decay should be bigger because the (hypothetical) mass of ν_τ is assumed to be larger than $m_e = 0.5 \text{ MeV}$. We hope to take all these effects into account in the subsequent publication.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Terry Walker for corroborating our results on the neutron to proton ratio for the case of massless neutrinos, as well as Dima Dolgov for assistance with

³ This is assuming that the neutrino decays only into particles present in the standard model

numerical work. The authors also benefitted from conversation with J. Primack.

References

- [1] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 1992, part 2.
- [2] S.S. Gerstein and Ya. B. Zeldovich, JETP Lett. **4**, 1966, 174;
R. Cowsik and J. McClelland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 1972, 669.
- [3] R.A Syunaev and Ya. B. Zeldovich, Pis'ma Astron. Zhurnal **6** , 1980, 451.
A.D. Dolgov Proc. of the XXII Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Leipzig 1984.
- [4] E. Kolb, M.S. Turner, A Chakravorty and D.N. Schramm Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1991, 533
- [5] T. Walker Ohio State preprint OSU-TA-1/93.
- [6] P. Gondolo and G. Gelmini Nucl. Phys. **B360**, 1991, 145.
- [7] G. Kane and I. Kani Nucl. Phys. **B277**, 1986, 525.
- [8] E. Kolb and K. Olive Phys. Rev. **D33** , 1986, 1202; (E)Phys. Rev. **D34**, 1986, 2531.
- [9] A.D. Dolgov and M. Fukugita, JETP Lett. **56**, 1992, 129; Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1992, 5378.
- [10] M.S. Turner and S. Dodelson Phys. Rev. **D46**, 1992, 3372.
B.D. Fields, S. Dodelson and M.S. Turner, FERMILAB-PUB-92/298-A.
- [11] A. D. Dolgov and K. Kainulainen Minnesota preprint TPI-MINN-92-T.
- [12] G.M. Fuller and R.A. Malaney, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 1991, 3136.

The bound in this paper is 300 keV . A more recent calculation by Enqvist and Uibo gives the more conservative bound of 740 keV ,

K. Enqvist and H. Uibo NORDITA preprint 92/87 P.